

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

January 12, 2006
Salisbury, North Carolina

The Historic Preservation Commission for the city of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, January 12, 2006, in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main St.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Michael Young.

In addition to Mr. Young, the following members were present: Raemi Evans, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Anne Lyles, Jeff Sowers, Kathy Walters and Wayne Whitman.

Absent: Mike Fuller

Michael Young welcomed all persons present. He read the purpose and procedure for the meeting.

Request for Certificates of Appropriateness

H-57-05 **424 W. Horah St.** - James David & Elizabeth Willingham, owner –
Certificate of Appropriateness to trim dead limbs off of front maple trees; limbs are less than 10 inches in diameter, tree truck is 28 inches

James Willingham was sworn to give testimony for the request.

From the slides presented by staff, Mr. Willingham pointed out the main limb extending out to the right of the maple tree and said, “the limb is dead - all the way dead.” He said if it were to fall it would hit the right edge of the porch as well as the car. In addition, he continued, there are several other smaller dead limbs that also need to be trimmed. They, too, were pointed out on the slide.

In response to a question from Kathy Walters, Mr. Willingham said he would hire a professional to do the work.

Michael Young read as follows from the landscape guidelines: *Pruning of large, mature trees that call for the employment of a tree service also requires a certificate of appropriateness. Pruning techniques that promote the health and natural growth of the tree are encouraged. Unnatural pruning techniques such as topping, stubbing, dehorning, or lopping are not appropriate. Tree pruning should follow accepted industry standards for arborists. (ANSI 300A Standards).*

Michael Young stated that as long as arborist standards are followed in trimming the trees, there should be no problem.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Ronald Fleming made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-57-05, that James David Willingham, owner of 424 W. Horah St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to trim dead limbs off front Maple tree; limbs are less than 10” in diameter, tree trunk is 28”; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Landscaping, pages 60-61, guideline 5 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; mitigating factors: the limbs were leafless during the past summer, and he will hire a qualified arborist to perform the trimming of dead limbs; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-57-05 be granted to James David Willingham and Elizabeth Willingham, owners of 424 W. Horah St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Wayne Whitman seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-01-06 220 S. Church St. – Bellsouth Telecommunications, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness for installation of metal coping cap at parapet of office roof – proposed coping to match existing coping on 2-story portion of building; also, installation of overflow scuppers to meet code

Keith Davis was sworn in as agent for Bellsouth.

Staff presented slides.

Mr. Davis informed the Commission that the 1-story section of the Bellsouth building currently has active leaks and is in need of re-roofing. He said the joints between the coping cap, a pre-cast unit, have split, contributing to the leaks inside the building. A White metal coping cap will be installed around the perimeter edge to match the cap on the existing 2-story section of the roof, which was re-roofed several years ago.

Mr. Davis testified that overflow scuppers will be installed on the back side of the building facing the gated parking lot. He informed the Commission that there is one existing, and 5 more will be installed to meet code requirements for drainage capacity.

In response to a question from Michael Young, Mr. Davis said from the information he was given, the building was built around 1958.

Janet Gapen, in explaining why the building is listed as “contributing” to the district, stated that sometimes the older maps can be difficult to discern, especially so if they were hand drawn. She said that though the map was coded as contributing it could have been that the quality of the map was not good.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Jeff Sowers made the motion as follows: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-02-06 – that Keith Davis, agent for Bellsouth Communications, owner of 220 S. Church St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to install metal coping cap at the parapet of the office, the coping will match the existing coping on a 2-story portion of the building; also, install overflow scuppers to meet code; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2 – Architectural Details and Ornamentation, page 29, guidelines 1-4 of the Non-residential Historic District Design Guideline; therefore, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-01-06 be granted to Keith Davis, agent of Bellsouth Telecommunications, owner of 220 S. Church St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-02-06 **1325 N. Main St.** – Spencer’s, Inc. and Larry Correll, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness to (1) replace one of the five 8’ x 9’ garage doors on the metal building with a 12’ x 14’ garage door (in White like the other doors) (2) fence around property (3) dumpster area with wooden fence

Jerry Davis, agent for Larry Correll, was sworn to give testimony for the requests.

Commission member Susan Hurt was excused from her seat for the hearing of this request.

Staff presented slides as Mr. Davis testified that the size of one of the building’s garage doors needed to be increased in order to have access to drive into the building. He testified that the new door would have the same basic elements as the other doors.

In response to a question from Kathy Walters, Mr. Davis said the building was constructed in 1999.

From the slides, Mr. Davis pointed out the location for the dumpster which will be placed around the corner on the left side of the building. The dumpster will be enclosed within a stockade type fence that will be totally enclosed on 2 sides, and will not be visible from the street. Kathy Walters stated that since the fence won’t be visible from the street, it would not need to be painted or stained.

He further testified that a chain link security fence will be installed and attached to the existing fence with 2 gates in order to enclose the entire property.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Kathy Walters made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-02-06 – that Carolina Roofing, Inc., represented by Jerry Davis, realtor and agent for Larry Correll and Spencer’s, Inc., owners of 1325 N. Main Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace one of five 8’x9’ garage doors on the metal building with a 12’x14’ White garage door, fence around the property, and install a dumpster area within a wooden fence; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2.4.2 – Changes to Buildings – Windows & Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1-4 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-02-06 be granted to Carolina Roofing, Inc., represented by Jerry Davis, realtor and agent for Larry Correll and Spencer’s, Inc., owners of 1325 N. Main St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Ron Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Commission to hear update regarding #H-02-05: 117, 119, 121 W. Fisher St. – First United Methodist Church, owner

Janet Gapen began by presenting the following facts concerning the property:

Significance

The buildings, built in 1900-1910, are turn-of-the-century architecture and considered contributing structures in the Salisbury Historic District, listed in the National Register in October 1975, they are included in the Downtown Historic District, which is a local historic district overlay adopted in 2001.

Architecture

The buildings are examples of 20th century commercial architecture with cast iron storefronts, and decorative brickwork. There is a possibility that brick patterns, with various colors of brick, would be found underneath the painted coating if removed. Hand hewn native granite details are also found on the buildings.

Uses

City Hall, Carolina Marble, and Holmes and Overman Buggy Co. each occupied the buildings at one time.

Street Façade

The buildings are very relevant to the street façade in that they define the block face on W. Fisher Street in a manner that is consistent with architecture of their time and consistent with the type of building pattern that is found in a downtown commercial area.

Janet Gapen informed the body that the Commission is appointed by City Council and authorized to interpret design guidelines on a case by case basis.

Demolitions in Local Districts

By state law, the Commission is not allowed to deny certificates of appropriateness for demolition in the local districts. The Commission is only allowed to delay demolition for up to 1 year. They have the leeway to propose, waive or reduce a delay period.

In the case of the church, the Commission imposed the maximum delay period of 1 year because the Commission felt that the buildings were significant and warranted the full extent of protection allowed by law.

She further stated that there have been no plans brought before the Commission for preview for a certificate of appropriateness. The certificate issued for the demolition was only for the demolition.

Time Line

1/13/05	Case first heard by the Commission, and tabled to the next meeting.
2/10/05	Certificate of Appropriateness issued with 365-day delay period (made retroactive to 1/13/05).
3/10/05	Commission formed committee to plan a course of action for ways to meet Commission's guidelines and to make sure the public was fully aware of the proposal.
5/19/05	Church's building committee met with the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC). DRAC is a group of local design professionals, who are not members of the Commission, but meet with applicants concerning new construction or additions to provide advice to the applicant.
7/14/05	Historic Salisbury Foundation met with the Commission to provide update on their efforts concerning the case.
8/10/05 – 8/25/05 – 9/09/05	Committee meetings held to prepare and determine a course of action for scheduling additional public hearings to make sure the community was fully aware.
9/19/05	Committee held a call meeting.
10/13/05	Commission adopted resolution to seek new legislation: Since Historic Preservation Commissions in the state of NC are not granted authority to deny demolition, there have been cities that have taken steps to have powers granted to the City Council allowing them to regulate demolition in historic districts; the city of Statesville pursued and was granted such legislation last June. The Commission decided to follow the same course of action.
11/15/05	The resolution was brought before the City Council and the City Council voiced support for new legislation.
12/12/05	Public meeting held at First United Methodist Church.
12/20/05	Commission's committee meeting held.
01/12/06	Commission meeting held.

1/13/06	Expiration date of the delay period. The Certificate of Appropriateness issued will become effective.
1/17/06	The City Council will consider a resolution to pursue the new legislation for the city of Salisbury, and will receive information concerning temporary restrictions on future demolition permits for a temporary period of time until the legislation can be reviewed by the General Assembly.
2/07/06	City Council will consider temporary restrictions on future demolitions.
6/06/06	The certificate of appropriateness will expire. The certificate may be renewed for an additional 6-month period without further review.
1/07/07	The certificate of appropriateness, if renewed, will expire.

Janet Gapen ended her presentation. There were no questions from the Commission.

Michael Young called Jeff Youngblood, of the Salisbury Fire Department, and the city's Housing Inspector for testimony.

Janet Gapen stated that Jeff Youngblood would handle the permit process for demolition, which he would explain.

Jeff Youngblood was sworn in by the Chairman to give testimony.

Mr. Youngblood testified that on November 15th the demolition application was filled out for the church prior to the council meeting on that day. He said they were informed that he could not review the application until he received the certificate of appropriateness from the Commission; after which he could proceed with the process for demolition. The process includes notifying all the adjoining property owners, and posting the building for a public hearing. In the public hearing, Mr. Youngblood said his job was basically to settle any legal disputes. He said he would need to make sure that there is no reason that the demolition should not proceed. He also approves the contractor, making sure they are licensed, bonded, and capable of doing the job. Mr. Youngblood stated that the hearing would not be of the type where persons come in to speak in support or opposition. The entire process would take about 15 days; then the permit could be issued. They would be allowed 180 days to complete the demolition.

There were no questions for Mr. Youngblood.

Andrew Pitner, 320 Mitchell Ave., was sworn to speak.

Mr. Pitner stated that he is a member of the coalition formed to help save W. Fisher St., and the vice-president of the Fulton Heights Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Pitner presented incentives that he said may help the church come up with some alternatives that might help them to preserve the buildings for their use. He testified that the coalition is willing to fund the items as a good faith effort to try to help the church identify some feasible alternatives that include saving the W. Fisher streetscape.

In a slide presentation, he presented the following incentives:

1. To engage an independent architect to help the church to try to develop some alternatives; this would include saving the historic structures.
2. To provide some type of professional guidance to the church, especially in pursuing state and federal tax credits.
3. To engage a local architect to help provide restoration consulting and help the church come up with plans that would be approvable while still saving the buildings.
4. To seek local trades-people to give reasonable quote estimates for the restoration would cost.

Mr. Pitner gave the following information concerning tax credits: A non-profit in and beyond itself is not allowed to pursue tax credits; however, a non-profit can partner with another company which may be a developer or someone who is leasing from a non-profit, and make efforts to restore the building and that group could pursue the tax credits. Thereby, the tax credits could be transferred down the line to whoever is occupying the building.

In response to a question from Susan Hurt, Mr. Pitner stated that the incentives had not been spoken of publicly before doing so at the present meeting.

Jack Thomson, Director, Historic Salisbury Foundation, was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Thomson began by informing persons present of a website put together by the coalition. The address is: [www.save historic salisbury.org](http://www.savehistoric Salisbury.org). He gave information as to what can be found on the site which includes links to other websites that will have information pertaining to the issue.

Mr. Thomson informed the body that he brought to the meeting copies of Chapter 3 from the Non-Residential Design Guidelines which deals specifically with new construction in historic districts and will illustrate the guidelines that will be used in reviewing new construction projects in the historic district.

Michael Young then opened the floor for anyone who desired to speak in favor or opposition of the proposed demolition.

There was no one present to speak either in favor or opposition to the issue.

Michael Young closed the public hearing.

Commission member Anne Lyles asked if there had been any offers for purchase of the buildings.

Dave Collins stated that there is an offer being considered by the church at the present time.

Michael Young gave the closing statement.

Committee Reports

Minor works

There were no questions of the submitted minor works listing.

Other Business

FY 2006-2007 Goals

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that the goals will go to the City Council at their meeting on January 17th.

Kathy Walters made the motion to approve the goals as presented. Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Minor Works Review Committee

Janet Gapen reminded the Commission that the committee members are Kathy Walters and Wayne Whitman. She stated that she and Wendy Spry have met and discussed some proposed additions to minor works so that the committee would have something to start with.

Kathy Walters mentioned that tree trimming should fall under minor works because staff is so heavily relied on with those requests. She said people would probably be more inclined to go through the process if it was an easier process. Commission members agreed.

The committee scheduled their first meeting for February 2nd at 2:30 p.m.

Guidelines for Public Art

The committee members are Michael Young and Jeff Sowers.

Janet Gapen said she has had a hard time finding other cities that have guidelines for public art. She recommended that the guidelines not deal with content of art but primarily placement. The committee agreed that Lynn Raker would be a good contact person for insight.

A meeting will be scheduled for early February.

Kathy Walters commended Janet Gapen for the 1st edition of the Commission's newsletter – *Preservation Link*, mailed out in January. She said she had heard very favorable comments from others as well. Commission members joined in with the accolades to Janet.

Jeff Sowers commended Michael Young for the closing remarks he gave at the end of the public hearing. All members agreed.

Minutes

The minutes from the December meeting were approved as presented upon a motion by Kathy Walters, seconded by Susan Hurt, and all members voting AYE.

Janet Gapen made the following announcements:

A training workshop/seminar, in conjunction with the City Council's annual retreat, will be held for boards and commissions will be held on Thursday, Feb. 9th; a reception will follow at the Trolley Barn. It was noted that the next commission meeting was on the same date.

A procedural training workshop for Commission members will be held on February 2nd, 3:30-5:30 in the Council Chambers. The class will be taught by Susan Hurt and will focus on procedural matters. She will work with 2 cases that were denied by the Commission and appealed to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Janet commented that the Commission is doing an exceptional job in making motions. She thanked Kathy Walters for the template that she took the responsibility of preparing.

Adjournment

Michael Young made the following motion: "I make a motion to recess this meeting to February 2nd at 3:30 in the City Council Chambers. Wayne Whitman seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Michael Young, Chairman

Judy Jordan, Secretary

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

February 9, 2006
Salisbury, North Carolina

The Historic Preservation Commission for the city of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, February 6, 2006, in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main St.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Michael Young.

In addition to Mr. Young, the following members were present: Raemi Evans, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Anne Lyles, Jeff Sowers, and Wayne Whitman.

Absent: Mike Fuller, Kathy Walters

Michael Young welcomed all persons present. He read the purpose and procedure for the meeting.

Request for Certificates of Appropriateness

H-03-06 **301 N. Main St.** – Belle Realty Development Co. & Wallace Realty, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness for additions to existing building

Gray Stout, agent for the applicant, was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides as Gray Stout described the proposed additions to the rear of the building.

He informed the Commission that the addition at this time would be on the rear of the building because the owners felt that the parking in front was important to their business; therefore, did not want the extension brought out to the street. The plan, he said, is for a covered area for 3 vehicles and the addition of a 20 ft. office space at the rear of the building.

Gray Stout testified that addition is a split level concept; however, in massing, it will appear closely related to the alignment of the windows of the existing building. The first floor of the addition will be a few steps up from the first floor of the existing building.

From the slides, the proposed elevations were shown. He showed that the windows on the 2nd floor line up and the window on the 1st floor is a little higher than the arched windows in the original building. From the rear elevations, he pointed out 3 vehicle bays, and a recessed entryway.

Gray Stout further testified that the owners would like the stucco that had been added during an earlier addition to be removed from the front façade and re-bricked. In addition, the rear addition will be brick and both painted to match the existing color.

He informed the Commission that from a preservation standpoint, he would like the older part of the structure to be distinguished from the new addition; therefore, the exact dentil detail of the cornice will not be repeated but only alluded to.

In viewing the elevation of the parking lot side of the building, Gray Stout stated that even though that side is not very visible from the street, it was a good opportunity to add more detail to a very plain side of the building, which he showed from the slides.

Wayne Whitman commented that the structure at one time had been a church; though Gray Stout was not aware of that, the statement was verified by Jeff Sowers.

Susan Hurt led the Commission into questions to Gray Stout from the guidelines as follows:

Additions Guidelines

1. Locate additions as inconspicuously as possible, on the rear or least character-defining elevation of historic buildings.

No questions.

2. Construct addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric. Also, ensure that character-defining features of the historic buildings are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Susan Hurt commented that the only features of the building that will be present after the addition is the back wall.

In response to Michael Young's comment that the rear addition was probably the only façade that had not been covered up or changed at one point or another, Gray Stout said there were 2, the Liberty St. side and the parking lot side on the interior of the building. He informed the Commission that because of parking underneath the addition, the 3 arched windows in the basement that are bricked up will be left exposed.

Jeff Sowers commented that even though the façade will be covered with new addition the new façade elements are represented – in the rhythm of the windows and in the scale of the windows.

Gray Stout testified that windows in the existing building are new infill windows, in response to a question from Michael Young.

3. Limit the size and the scale of additions so that they do not visually overpower historic buildings.

Jeff Sowers commented that the criteria is met because it does line up with the existing building and is not over-sized, and the original building is distinguished from the new addition through its architectural features.

4. Design additions so that they are differentiated from the historic building. It is not appropriate to duplicate the form, the material, the style, and the detail of the historic building so closely that the integrity of the original building is lost or compromised.

Jeff Sowers asked if the windows for the new addition would be clad or wood.

Gray Stout testified that the proposed windows are clad SDL windows. The windows will be wood with aluminum cladding and simulated divided light grills. In response to a question from Jeff Sowers, he stated that the proportion of the panes will match the existing.

Michael Young read the following guidelines from Materials, Design Elements, and Rhythm from the Non-Residential Design Guidelines

- Use materials that are similar to those commonly found in the district such as brick, stone, and metal.
- Architectural details such as windows, arches, and cornices should complement that of existing historic structures.
- Aluminum cladding, vinyl and plastic siding and details are not appropriate.
- New windows and doors should be compatible in proportion, shape, position, location, pattern, and size with windows and doors of contributing structures in the district.

Susan Hurt asked if the existing windows on the side of the building were true divided light. Mr. Stout stated that they have mullions on the outside, further stating that the existing windows on the front are vinyl (metal) windows. He said, "What I want to do is put in the SDLs in the addition that match the proportion of the original building and the width of the mullion."

In response to the questions concerning the windows, Janet Gapen stated that the precedence has been for simulated divided light as long as there is mullion on the outside of the pane. Gray Stout testified that that was exactly what he would be doing.

5. Design additions so that they can be removed in the future without damaging the historic building in mass, materials, color, and proportion and spacing of windows and doors.

In reference to materials, Gray Stout showed from the slides the stucco on the front façade that would be removed in response to a question from Michael Young.

He commented that he would consider their thoughts on the stucco if they preferred that the façade be left stucco, stating that the owners chose to remove it in order to, more or less, dress up the building. Michael Young stated that they had no problems with the stucco removal.

As for the colors, he testified that the colors would remain the same.

6. Design additions so that they can be removed in the future without damaging the historic building.

Gray Stout testified that the back wall would be left exposed. He said steel beams would be run parallel with the building so they could be easily removed.

7. It is not appropriate to construct an addition that is taller than the original building.

The over-all height of the addition will be the same height as the original building, so testified Gray Stout.

Following the Commission's questions to Gray Stout and discussion of the guidelines for New Construction and Additions from the Non-Residential Design Guidelines, Jeff Sowers recommended that he come back with more details on the windows, light fixtures for the rear of the building, and brick sample for texture.

Gray Stout agreed to come back with the additional details.

There was no one present to speak in support of or opposition to the request.

Susan Hurt made the motion as follows:

"I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-03-06 – that Gray Stout, architect and agent for Belle Realty Development Co. & Wallace Realty, owners of 301 N. Main St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an addition to the existing building, that Gray Stout testified on behalf of the owners of the building and no one else appeared to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 3 – New Construction & Additions – Additions, page 50, Guidelines 1-7 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-03-06 be granted to Gray Stout, architect and agent for Belle Realty Development Co. & Wallace Realty, owners of 301 N. Main St., to make the changes detailed in the application, with the following request: that Mr. Stout return with more detailed information about the light fixtures, the proposed brick sample, and the windows."

Raemi Evans seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-04-06 **111 N. Main St.** – Bernhardt TV Hardware Co., owner – Certificate of Appropriateness to remove all rotted wood from false front put on the building about 1955 using a city grant and replace as closely as possible as it originally was; also, repaint cream to match 2nd floor of building with black above and below (no sign at this time)

Paul Bernhardt was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Bernhardt testified that his request involves repair from storm damage. He informed the Commission that the building was good condition until January 6th when a wind storm ripped the sign and most of the plywood from the building. He then gave a brief history of the buildings which he owns at 111, 113, 115, N. Main St., which included the fact that the buildings are probably 90% as they were when constructed in 1880 by Edwin Shaver.

In 1955 the glass siding across the front of the building was removed and replaced with untreated plywood. He brought a bag of the plywood that had come down during the storm to the meeting to show Commission members. Mr. Bernhardt stated that there were cement panels behind the plywood. From the slides he pointed out two 2 ½” wide wood strips located on the top and bottom of the panel which have also rotted, causing rain and cold air into the building.

Mr. Bernhardt testified that he would like to put two 3 ½” strips of wood into the openings and then paint to make it look as it originally looked in 1950. He said he would paint it in any color they specified. He said, “Our main purpose is to try to make it look attractive.”

Mr. Bernhardt further testified that he did not want to replace the sign that crashed during the storm; however, he would like to locate the street address on the top of the panel.

In response to a question from Michael Young, Mr. Bernhardt stated that the first pictures he saw after the storefront was renovated in 1940 by the shoe store did not show spandrel glass, but it went up at some time before the 1955 renovation when the glass fell out and was replaced with plywood.

Michael Young asked Mr. Bernhardt if he would consider going back to spandrel glass now that the plywood was falling out.

Mr. Bernhardt said he wished that he could return the building to its original but could not because of the cost. In addition he said, “I am not a fan of glass.”

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Susan Hurt referred the members to the non-residential Storefront Guidelines:

Reconstruction

4. If replacement of a deteriorated storefront feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail.

Susan Hurt said, “We are not bringing it back to the original, we are going to bring it back to what fell out during the storm damage.”

Michael Young said, “We are bringing it back to the 1950’s improvement.”

Jeff Sowers said he did not agree with Mr. Bernhardt’s proposal is to paint what he has because it is somewhat a patchwork job. He said the material should be more substantial in order to hold up.

In response to a question from Jeff Sowers, Mr. Bernhardt said that he was not interested in pursuing a grant for the building.

Michael Young read the following guidelines retaining to preservation and reconstruction of storefronts:

1. *Retain and preserve historic storefronts and storefront features such as entryways, display windows, doors, transoms, corner posts, etc.*
2. *Whenever possible, retain and preserve historic materials. Avoid the removal of historic materials or architectural features.*
3. *Whenever repairing or renovating, it is recommended that any non-historic storefront or façade treatments including metal cladding or other non-historic alterations be removed.*
4. *If replacement of a deteriorated storefront or storefront feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale proportion, material, texture and detail.*
5. *When reconstructing a historic storefront, base the design on historical research and evidence. Maintain the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements.*
6. *Whenever changes are required to meet building or accessibility codes, they should be done in a way that is the least intrusive to the façade and without destroying historic materials and features.*

Michael Young stated that in order to meet the guidelines it would either have to go back to the glass as it once was or with the plywood that fell out.

Susan Hurt commented that she did not see any way to the set the precedence as meeting the design guidelines as they are written.

Anne Lyles, referring to the new design guideline 7: *Where original or early storefronts no longer exist or are too deteriorated to save, retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic buildings*, asked if they could use the fact that putting the plywood up might be a means of protecting it more.

Jeff Sowers stated that he did not think the plywood was the way to go because it would not be a permanent solution. He suggested that they look at other downtown storefronts that have spandrel glass or use of other compatible methods.

In response to a question from Ron Fleming who asked if the surface was exposed before the plywood went up, Mr. Bernhardt said he did not know whether or not it was exposed.

Mr. Bernhardt presented a sample of the wood he proposes to use for the replacement. He stated that the open spaces really need to be covered in order to prevent rain and wind from going into the building. The most practical way to do that, he said, is to glue the wood over the space using a 50-year adhesive.

Michael Young stated that since a lot of times sign panels were constructed of plywood, it was his opinion that a case could be made of going back with exterior grade plywood, painted, and some type of molding put on it. However, Jeff Sowers stated they would be allowing a substrate to be the finished product. Susan Hurt agreed that the painted concrete, either from the design or compatibility point-of-view, would meet the guidelines. She said, "It was not a voluntary change."

Jeff Sowers suggested tabling the request.

Michael Young then explained to Mr. Bernhardt that it did not seem that he would have a consensus to allow painting the concrete. He further explained that the Commission does not want something that was never left exposed now to become exposed.

Mr. Bernhardt asked if the Commission would allow him to only put something over the openings and leave the rest as it is. He said he thinks he has the right to protect the property in some way.

Michael Young then called for the motion which was made by Wayne Whitman as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-04-06 – that Paul Bernhardt, agent for Bernhardt TV Hardware Company, owner of 111 N. Main St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove all rotten wood from the 1955 false building front, and replace as closely as possible as it was originally; repaint Cream to match 2nd floor of the building with Black above and below; there was no one to appear before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Storefronts, pages 20-22, guidelines 1-7 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of

Appropriateness for Application #H-04-06 be granted to Paul Bernhardt, agent for Bernhardt TV Hardware Co., owner of 111 N. Main St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Michael Young informed the Commission that if the vote does not pass, they will need to list the Findings of Fact as to why.

Susan Hurt noted that the application says, “To replace the wood.” Michael Young read the application as it was presented. He said that is the motion that has been made.

Susan Hurt seconded the motion.

Commission members Evans, Fleming Hurt, Lyles, Whitman and Young voted AYE. Commission member Sowers voted NO.

Michael Young explained to Mr. Bernhardt that he had been granted the Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the plywood. He said if he wanted to do something different he would need to come back before Commission.

In response to Mr. Bernhardt’s question as to whether he had the authority to simply close in the 2 opening where the rain is coming into, Michael Young said, “At this point you would be required to replace the plywood.”

H-05-06 **316 S. Fulton St.** – Fowler Estate, owner; C. Cary Grant, agent – Certificate of Appropriateness to (1) repair all exterior boxing and fascia boards (2) repaint exterior trim: Benjamin Moore OC17 White Dove (3) repair concrete turn-around from fallen tree (4) replace slate roof (5) add storm windows to match trim color and window detail

Cary Grant, agent; Chip Short, attorney; Frances Taylor, prospective buyer; and John Helms, architect, were sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides.

Chip Short informed the Commission that he is the attorney for the heirs of the Jane McCanless Fowler family and is also present in support of Robert & Frances Taylor, prospective buyers of the property. The sale; however, is subject to certain conditions that will be discussed including the slate roof that he would be speaking to.

Mr. Short responded “yes” when asked by the Chair if had read the guidelines.

He began by giving some statistics pertaining to the property, stating that from his own personal research of the houses in the 100-400 blocks of S. Fulton St., he found that there are 16 homes with shingles as are proposed for the subject property, 4 slate roofs, 3 metal, 2 tile, 1 combination and 1 asbestos.

From those facts he has determined that since only 20% of the homes on Fulton St. have slate roofs, the significance of having a slate roof is not a major factor to the appearance of the neighborhood

Mr. Short informed the Commission of facts regarding the Fowler estate, and stated that the real issue is the fact that there is no money in the estate to make repairs. He testified that the cost for a new slate roof as opposed to a shingle roof is \$52,000. Mr. Short further stated that repairs were made to the roof in 1972, 1981, and 1989, which reveals that damage to the roof has existed for more than 30 years. Each contractor who inspected the roof said that they could not insure that a new slate roof would be supported by the existing infrastructure of the house. Therefore, he said, the Taylors cannot continue with the contract unless they can put shingles, or something other than slate, on the house. With roof repairs alone totaling as much as \$150,000, the bank will not agree to loan any more money on the house which causes quite a problem for them. He said, "I can assure you that this deal will not go through if a slate roof has to be maintained, and if this deal does not go through I don't see any other deals on the horizon...."

Mr. Short presented pictures to show the extent of the damage.

Michael Young read for review the following roof guidelines:

1. *Retain and preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs. **No changes to be made.***
2. *Retain and preserve all architectural features that are character-defining elements of the roof, such as cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and turrets. **No changes to be made.***
3. *Retain and preserve historic roofing material whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new material that matches the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute material only if the original material is not technically feasible.*

Mr. Short testified that the extent of repairs necessary is much greater than what would be necessary if a lighter weight shingle was used. He presented a sample of the proposed asphalt shingle, and also a sample of the existing slate.

4. *Locate roof ventilators, antennas, and solar collectors on non-character-defining roofs or inconspicuously on rear slopes where they will not be visible from the street. It is not appropriate to locate them on front or street elevations. **None will be located on street elevations.***
5. *Install low-profile ridge vents if they are desired, provided that they do not diminish the original design of the roof or destroy historic roofing materials and details. **To be discussed.***
6. *It is not appropriate to paint or apply coatings to roofing material that was historically not coated. **No paint.***

7. Generally, it is not appropriate to install light-colored asphalt shingles.
8. Generally, it is not appropriate to replace concealed, or built-in, gutters with exposed gutters. **Gutters are not exposed.**
9. It is not appropriate to introduce new roof features, such as skylights, vents, and dormers, if they would diminish the original design of the roof or damage historic roofing materials or features.

John Helms, the architect was sworn to give testimony relating to the request.

Mr. Helms testified that the contractors who had looked at the roof to give estimates determined that the front porch would not last because of the pitch of the roof and would have to be removed and redone. He referred Commission members to the slides of the roof's interior and pointed out the support members which were totally bending and about ready to snap. He said slate weighs 4 times as much as shingles and the roof would not be able to support the weight. He said, "We don't know what could go back on that roof without redesigning it which would not be original anyway."

Michael Young commented that exceptions have been made with rubber shingles and simulated slate shingles.

Mr. Short presented a Certificate of Appropriateness issued for the approval of architectural shingles on an existing slate roof in 1987. Michael Young said, "I don't think the rubber shingle was even available in 1987."

Frances Taylor was sworn to give testimony.

Ms. Taylor informed the Commission that in seeking a roof alternative she has found that the rubber roof does not have a proven history of retaining its color underneath the sunlight. The proposed asphalt shingle is lifetime, the simulated rubber is not. She gave the address of a structure that has a simulated slate roof, put on in 1985, that is already "very splotchy." Ms. Taylor continued by stating that the asphalt shingle is intended to replicate slate in size and in thickness. In addition, the proposed shingle does not have the fade factor that the simulated rubber does. She said those were the reasons that they elected to go with the proposed product.

Susan Hurt stated that with testimony showing that the wood framing was not designed in a way to support the weight of the slate roof shows that there are questions about the technical feasibility of the house.

Ms. Taylor pointed out from the slides the conditions of the wood framing. She stated that the amount of water that is coming into the house has caused termite damage all the way to the ceiling on the 2nd floor, and showed 3 jacks holding up a beam that is very close to falling in.

Jack Thomason, Historic Salisbury Foundation, came forward to make comments pertaining to the request.

Mr. Thomson stated that he would definitely like to see the house restored as it is located in the heart of the district; however, it would be unfortunate to lose the slate even though he could see that there are some design issues. He asked if consideration had been given to reinforcing some of the design issues from below in order to allow a lot of the original roofing material to remain. He also voiced his concern about costs being a consideration as it pertains to decisions made by the Commission.

Following Mr. Thomson's comments the public hearing was closed for deliberation by the Commission.

Jeff Sowers stated that he thinks the slate on the structure looks very substantial and still had a long life left in it; however, the fasteners may be giving away. He said he has some concerns about putting slate back on the existing substructure because of the support of the roof system. In response to his question as to whether the roof had been inspected by a structural engineer, Mr. Grant said there had not been.

Anne Lyles said she would not want to see the house continue to deteriorate to the point that it could not be saved.

Michael Young stated that possibly the design of the roof could make an exception for removing the slate because it would not be able to accommodate the weight.

Susan Hurt said the question is that once the wood is repaired sufficiently for the shingle roof how close it would be to structural support for replacing the slate roof. She said, "if the roof is repaired to support a shingle roof and it just won't support a slate roof then it is not technically feasible to replace the slate roof."

Michael Young noted that slate roofs have been allowed that were of less damage. Jeff Sowers reminded him that a substitute material was allowed because there was not enough of the original material left to warrant putting it back.

In response to a question from Anne Lyles, Jeff Sowers said if the slate is removed properly it would not be a problem. He said the slate is falling off because the fasteners are giving away.

Michael Young asked that the other requested issues be addressed:

- 1) repair all exterior boxing and fascia

Mr. Grant stated that the boxing is in terrible shape because of the leak in the roof. He referred the Commission to the slides in order to show the damage. In response to Michael Young's question pertaining to the materials that would be used for the repair, Ms. Taylor stated that it would be a replication of what already exist.

2) repair concrete turn-around from fallen tree

Mr. Grant stated that damage to the concrete driveway was caused by roots coming up from underneath and also because of the tree that fell on it. He said the concrete would be removed and replaced with new concrete.

3) Add storm windows to match trim color and window detail

Mr. Grant testified that the house does not have storm windows but are needed to preserve energy.

Jeff Sowers read the following guideline for windows:

- 7. If exterior storm windows are desired, select ones that are coated with paint or a baked-enamel finish in a color appropriate to the color of the building. Install them so that existing windows and frames are not damaged or obscured.*

Mr. Grant said he did not have a sample or elevation for the windows. Mrs. Taylor described the proposed windows.

Michael Young stated that there were no other items of contention except the slate roof.

Susan Hurt stated that she did not think that there is anything that would support the replacement of the slate roof. However, more information is needed to decide that it is not technically feasible.

Michael Young stated that the guidelines make no provision for hardship on costs. He said, "This is really in serious disrepair – structurally and cosmetically."

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Janet Gapen asked if it would be appropriate to replace the porch roof with a different material. She suggested a metal type roof on the porch and retain the slate on the main roof.

Jeff Sowers stated that 3 and 12 is the minimum slope that you can have for asphalt shingles. He said that in his opinion as an architect the metal roof would be more appropriate since it was stated that the porch is 12.

In response to questions from Susan Hurt, Mr. Short stated that the roof inspections made by both K. W. Arthur and Statesville Roofing determined that the roof will not support a new slate roof.

The motion was then made by Susan Hurt as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning #H-05-06 – that C. Cary Grant, agent for Fowler Estate, owner of 316 S. Fulton Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair all exterior boxing and fascia boards,

repaint exterior in Benjamin Moore OC17 White Dove, repair concrete turn-around that was damaged by a fallen tree, replace the slate roof with a life-time asphalt shingle GAF Berkshire Collection by Owen-Corning in a Charcoal Gray, and add storm windows with matching trim color and window detail; that Ms. Taylor and John Helms, and Chip Short appeared to support the motion, that Jack Thomson appeared to make comments about the motion; this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2- Changes to Buildings – Exterior Walls & Trim, pages 12-13, guidelines 2,3,and 5-9; Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Windows & Doors, pages 14-15, guideline 7; Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Roofs, pages 10-11, guidelines 1-3 and 5-9; Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Driveways & Off-street Parking, pages 58-59, guidelines 1,3,9, and 13 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; I further move that the Commission find that guideline 3 of the roofing guidelines requires that substitute materials only be considered if the original material is not technically feasible, and that there was extensive testimony that due to design features of the particular house and the shape of the supporting materials in the house it would not be technically feasible to replace the slate roof; that regarding the driveway, the driveway will match the size and shape of the existing driveway exactly; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for application #H-05-06 be granted to C. Cary Grant, agent for Fowler Estate, owner of 316 S. Fulton St. to make the changes detailed in the application with the following change that was agreed to here by the current and future owners of the home – that the roof on the porch be replaced with a standing seam metal roof.”

Wayne Whitman seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE

H-06-06 **130 W. Innes St.** – Rowan County, owner - Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 250 KW emergency generator in rear of structure as per drawing, unit to be screened from view with brick fencing/wall, brick to be yellow to match building with open pattern

Ken Deal was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Deal testified that the emergency generator will be located behind the Administration Building and is needed to prevent the loss of communication throughout the county, as well as the computer system, should power ever shut down.

He testified that the generator would be totally hidden from the street by a new brick wall, as well as being hidden by the building.

From the slides he showed exactly where the brick wall would be located. He said the existing Black railing would be removed and the wall would be built on top of the concrete. The brick will match the existing brick on the adjoining post office building.

In response to Michael Young's question as to why that particular site was chosen, Mr. Deal stated that the roof was a consideration but the generator was too large; making sure that parking spaces would not be eliminated was a great concern. In addition, the further away the generator is placed the harder it is manage its security, and the wiring and running of the conduit. He said they had struggled a long time trying to find a place to put it.

Susan Hurt read the following guidelines:

Utilities and Energy Retrofit Guidelines

10. *Install mechanical equipment, including heating and air conditioning units, in areas and spaces requiring the least amount of alteration to the appearance and the materials of the building such as roofs. Screen the equipment from view.*

Side and Rear Façade Guidelines

3. *Whenever a side or rear façade can be seen from the public right-of-way or parking area, it is encouraged that any unnecessary utility lines, mechanical equipment, pipes, etc. be removed. Whenever introducing new utility or service features such as mechanical units and garbage receptacles, screen them from public view with fences, low walls, or landscaping.*

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Raemi Evans made the motion as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-06-06 – that Ken Deal, agent for Rowan County, owner of 130 W. Innes St. appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 250 kilowatt emergency generator in rear of structure as per drawing; unit to be screened from view with yellow brick fencing/wall matching building with open pattern; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Utilities & Energy Retrofit , pages 42-43, guideline 10; Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Side & Rear Facades, pages 26-28, guideline 3 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-06-06 be granted to Ken Deal, agent for Rowan County, owner of 130 W. Innes St. to make the changes detailed in the application."

Susan Hurt seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Committee Reports

Minor Works: There were no questions of the submitted minor works.

Minor Works Revision Committee report

Janet Gapen passed out copies of the proposed revisions for Residential and Non-Residential

She asked that Commission members review and consider the changes for discussion at the March meeting.

Procedural Training report

The minutes from the procedural training held on February 9th were given to members in order to be approved at the March meeting.

Michael Young thanked Susan Hurt for facilitating the workshop. He encouraged those who were not able to attend to make every effort to do so the next one.

Wayne Whitman commented that the training held for Boards and Commissions as a part of the City Council's Goal Setting session was excellent.

Other Business

Update: 117, 119, & 121 W. Fisher St.

Janet Gapen informed Commission members that the next step is the documentation of the building before demolition. She referred the members to the Non-Residential Design Guidelines, page 65. Michael Young read the following guidelines:

- Make a permanent record of a significant structure before demolition. The record shall consist of black-and-white photographs and other documents, such as drawings, that describe the architectural character and the special features of the building. The Commission determines on a case-by-case basis the precise documentation of a specific building that is required and the person who is responsible for producing that documentation. The documentation must be submitted for review by the Commission before demolition. The record is retained by the City of Salisbury.
- Work with the Commission to identify salvageable materials and potential buyers or recipients of salvaged materials. The removal of salvageable building materials before demolition is encouraged, and may be required depending on the significance of the building.
- Clear the structure quickly and thoroughly.
- Submit a site plan illustrating proposed landscaping and any other site development to be completed after demolition.
- Plant the site or appropriately maintain it until it is reused. If the site is to remain vacant for over one year, it should be improved to reflect an appearance consistent with other open areas in the district.

Janet Gapen stated that even though the Commission does not review interior; in this case the interior should also be documented since the guidelines mention identifying salvageable materials. Susan Hurt suggested that the presentation made by David Bergstone on the history of the occupants and uses be included in the documentations.

Michael Young ruled as the motion the following: That, the Commission will take responsibility for the documentation and arrange for the site visit; describe the architectural character and special features of the building; require documentation before demolition; specify that the documents be held by the City of Salisbury; meet on site with the property owner to identify salvageable materials and potential buyers and recipients of salvaged materials; watch over demolition to make sure it is done quickly and thoroughly; require that the site plan is presented prior to the demolition starting; and landscape be presented for its reuse.

Jeff Sowers seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Michael Young called Jack Thomson to give some information regarding the motions that will be made at the First Methodist Church on February 12th.

Jack Thomson stated that the church will meet as an assembly to take a vote on a resolution presented by the Trustees to dispose of the buildings either by demolition or by relocation of the buildings by a 3rd party. Should the vote be negative, a new resolution will be written. He further stated that there is an opportunity for someone to offer an amendment to the resolution that includes alternatives to demolition.

Michael Young asked if the church still had plans to vote on an option to help defray some of the costs to move the buildings as in an offer made to the church by Downtown Salisbury.

Mr. Thomson said they have offered the buildings for relocation; however, he was unsure of contributions to help in defraying some of the cost for moving them. He said the current estimate for moving them is \$640,000.00 but does not include land acquisition, site preparation, foundation construction or any reconstruction of the buildings.

He said they also have an offer from Historic Salisbury Foundation and Downtown Salisbury, Inc., to purchase the buildings at an amount greater than their original purchase price.

Mr. Thomson stated that there had been a concern by the chairman of the Building Committee that the Certificate of Appropriateness would not be renewed after the 6-month expiration date; however, he has been assured through a letter from Wendy Spry that the Certificate could indeed be renewed without a problem.

He informed the Commission that the documentation of the building is of utmost importance. As far as salvaged materials are concerned, he asked that they remember the building was formerly City Hall so there could archives, maps, emblems, etc. that need to be salvaged.

Anne Lyles commended Jack Thomson and the Historic Salisbury for their help throughout the entire process.

Michael Young called for Dave Collins to come forward for the last remarks if he was still present in the building. He was not present.

Preserve America Application

Janet Gapen stated that the resolution submitted to City Council was approved at their last meeting. The deadline for the application is March 1 but applications are accepted throughout the year so a complete application will be put together. She will share additional information at the March meeting.

Preservation Month

Janet Gapen asked that consideration be given to the information provided and it will be further discussed at another meeting.

Enforcement procedures update

Moved to the agenda for March

Minor works Committee

Jeff Sowers reminded Commission members that during the workshop it became apparent that there is some vagueness in the guidelines.

Janet Gapen suggested that the minor works committee also look at the changes that are needed in the guidelines as well. The chairman and other members agreed with that suggestion.

Minutes

The January minutes were approved as presented upon a motion by Wayne Whitman, seconded by Susan Hurt, and all members voting AYE.

Adjournment

With no other business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Michael Young, Chairman

Judy Jordan, Secretary

